

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

August 14, 2013
MAG Office, Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Jackie Meck, Buckeye, Chair	* Joseph La Rue, State Transportation Board
Vice Mayor Jack Sellers, Chandler, Vice Chair	# Lt. Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, Gila River
# F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation	Indian Community
Oversight Committee	Mayor Georgia Lord, Goodyear
* Ron Barnes, Total Transit	Mayor Mark Mitchell, Tempe
Dave Berry, Swift Transportation	# Garrett Newland, Macerich
* Jed Billings, FNF Construction	Mayor Tom Rankin, Florence
* Councilmember Cathy Carlat, Peoria	Mayor Marie Lopez Rogers, Avondale
Vice Mayor Ben Cooper, Gilbert	Mayor Scott Smith, Mesa
Supervisor Clint Hickman, Maricopa County	Mayor Greg Stanton, Phoenix
* Mark Killian, The Killian Company/Sunny	Karrin Kunasek Taylor, DMB Properties
Mesa, Inc.	Mayor Jerry Weiers, Glendale
Mayor W. J. "Jim" Lane, Scottsdale	Mayor Sharon Wolcott, Surprise
* Not present	
# Participated by telephone conference call	+ Participated by videoconference call

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) was called to order by Chair Mayor Jackie Meck at 12:00 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Lt. Governor Stephen Roe Lewis, Mr. Roc Arnett, and Mr. Garrett Newland participated in the meeting by telephone.

Chair Meck welcomed Mayor Tom Rankin to his first TPC meeting. He noted that Mayor Rankin had been elected by the Regional Council to serve on the TPC.

Chair Meck announced that on August 7, 2013, the MAG Management Committee recommended approval of items 4B, 4C, and 4D that were on the TPC agenda. He noted that at each place was material for agenda item #5.

Chair Meck requested that members of the public fill out blue cards for Call to the Audience and yellow cards for consent or action items on the agenda. He stated that parking garage validation and transit tickets for those who purchased transit tickets to attend the meeting were available from staff.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Meck stated that an opportunity is provided to the public to address the Transportation Policy Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Transportation Policy Committee requests an exception to this limit. Those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard.

Chair Meck noted that no comment cards had been received.

4. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chair Meck stated that agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, and #4D were on the consent agenda. He stated that public comment is provided for consent items, and noted that no public comment cards had been received. Chair Meck asked members if they would like to remove any of the consent agenda items or have a presentation. No requests were noted.

Mayor Lord moved to recommend approval of agenda items #4A, #4B, #4C, and #4D on the consent agenda. Vice Mayor Cooper seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4A. Approval of the May 15, 2013, Meeting Minutes

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, approved the May 15, 2013, meeting minutes.

4B. Project Changes – Amendment and Administrative Modification to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program, and Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the amendments and administrative modifications to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the FY 2014 Arterial Life Cycle Program and Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. The FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2010 Update were approved by the MAG Regional

Council on July 28, 2010, and have been modified twenty six times, with the latest approval on June 19, 2013. Since then, there was a need to modify projects in the programs. An administrative correction is pending Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration approval. The requested project changes include Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Regional Area Road Funds, and locally funded projects. Projects included in the request may require a conformity consultation. The requested project changes were recommended for approval on August 1, 2013, by the MAG Transportation Review Committee and on August 7, 2013, by the MAG Management Committee.

4C. MAG Federally Funded, Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the MAG Federally Funded, Locally Sponsored Project Development Status Report, and of actions that defer, delete, advance, and change projects; and of the necessary amendments and administrative modifications to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. The MAG Federal Fund Programming Guidelines and Procedures, approved by the MAG Regional Council on October 26, 2011, outline the requirements for local agencies to submit status information on the development of their federally funded projects. The Project Development Status Report focuses mainly on projects funded with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds that are programmed to obligate in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2013, 2014, and 2015 and the number of project deferrals. The Project Development Status workbook sent to member agencies in the May/June timeframe required that a project development schedule be completed and that project changes could be requested. Information submitted by local agencies was at times cross checked with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Local Government section for feasibility and further inquiries were made by MAG staff. The Project Development Status Report identifies the projects programmed to obligate in FY 2014 and 2015 that are requesting a deferral to a later year, requesting to be deleted or have funds reprogrammed, and that are projected to obligate based on the schedule submitted. The Project Development Status Report also is a final inventory for ADOT of the projects programmed to obligate in FFY 2013. A separate agenda item lists individual project change line items with the requested FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update amendments and modifications. This item was recommended for approval on August 1, 2013, by the MAG Transportation Review Committee and on August 7, 2013, by the MAG Management Committee.

4D. FY 2013 Draft Transit Program of Projects for Federal Funds

The Transportation Policy Committee, by consent, recommended approval of the FY 2013 MAG Transit Program of Projects, amendments to the FY 2011-2015 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate to the Regional Transportation Plan 2010 Update. The draft transit program of projects is utilized to develop the grant for submittal to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Upon approval by the MAG Regional Council, the City of Phoenix (the region's designated and direct recipient of FTA funds) will build the grant for submittal to FTA. MAG provides the concurrence on the grant application. FTA has advised us that they prefer the

grant application to be submitted prior to the 2013 Federal Fiscal Year ending September 30, 2013. A draft listing of projects was recommended for approval by the Transit Committee on June 13, 2013. Since then, there have been a few modifications. This item was recommended for approval on August 1, 2013, by the MAG Transportation Review Committee and on August 7, 2013, by the MAG Management Committee.

5. Update on Transportation Revenues

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, provided a report on transportation revenues. Mr. Anderson stated that a grim picture of existing transportation revenue was painted at the April TPC meeting. He noted that the purpose of his presentation was to stimulate discussion on augmenting transportation funding resources.

Mr. Anderson said that current sales tax projections reflect a 40 percent decrease compared to the 2002 projections done in preparation for the Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Anderson stated that the Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) projections also are lower than the original projections and are similar to 2004 and 2005 levels.

Mr. Anderson then commented on the combined federal and state gas tax rate chart (dated July 2013) that was at each place by saying that the amount of tax collected by Arizona is nearly the lowest at 37.4 cents tax per gallon and California collects the most tax: more than 70 cents tax per gallon.

Mr. Anderson then reviewed three major components of transportation funding. He said that operations and maintenance funding for transit, streets and highways needs to be permanent and sustainable. He noted that some of the Proposition 400 revenue is used for highway maintenance and transit operations, however, when the tax sunsets, operations and maintenance funding will be at risk.

Mr. Anderson stated that capital program funding, which started with a 20-year tax under Proposition 300 and continued with the 20-year tax in Proposition 400, is project specific and limited to the term of the tax in this region. He advised that San Diego's Transnet tax has a term of 40 years, and Glendale's and Tempe's transportation taxes have no sunset. Mr. Anderson advised that a sunset on capital funding is acceptable because it provides the opportunity to demonstrate to the voters that the decision makers can deliver on their promises.

Mr. Anderson stated that tools could capture the benefits of public sector investments, such as the increased value of the property around freeways. He explained that Arizona has no provision for before and after appraisal methodology and no way to capture the increases in land values when infrastructure is built. Mr. Anderson stated that on the trip to Salt Lake City, MAG staff heard about a number of redevelopment tools, such as tax increment financing, that they use to capture some of the value of public sector investments.

Mr. Anderson stated that revenue categories were examined. He said that the genesis of the categories was a study by the Utah Foundation to augment transportation revenues. Mr. Anderson noted that the graph at each place showing potential funding sources was divided into three categories: Fuel Tax Options, Sales Tax Options, and Other Options.

Mr. Anderson first explained Fuel Tax Options. An indexed five-cent local option fuel tax in Maricopa County could raise \$108 million per year on average over the next ten years. Mr. Anderson noted that some states, Nevada, for example, allow counties to levy a gas tax which the local agency is allowed to retain. He noted that Reno, Nevada, has a nine-cent per gallon fuel tax in addition to state and federal taxes.

Mr. Anderson stated that another fuel tax option is indexing the current state fuel tax to the Consumer Price Index. He said that this is the least intrusive option. Mr. Anderson explained that this option includes the current 18 cents per gallon tax and one cent per gallon underground storage tax and indexes it for future inflation. Mr. Anderson noted that this option could raise approximately \$115 million per year statewide on average for ten years.

Mr. Anderson explained another fuel tax option is to add five cents (unindexed) to the current fuel tax. He said that this option could raise \$178 million per year on average for ten years. Mr. Anderson stated that approximately 50.5 percent of Arizona's HURF goes to ADOT for the state highway system, approximately 30 percent goes to cities and towns, and approximately 19 percent goes to counties.

Mr. Anderson stated that another fuel tax option is adding five cents fuel tax and indexing state and federal fuel taxes to the Consumer Price Index, which could generate the most additional revenue – approximately \$429 million per year on average – that would be kept in Arizona. He said that this was similar to a local tax levied in Washoe County, Nevada, where all of the local tax funds remain in the area. Mr. Anderson stated that in Arizona, the HURF is constitutionally limited to roads and streets, which means that transit capital and operations need to be funded another way.

Mr. Anderson then addressed Sales Tax Options. He stated that the option for obtaining maximum revenue applies a sales tax to fuel sales, which would be on top of the existing fuel taxes, and could generate approximately \$1 billion per year for ten years. Mr. Anderson noted that he had used a 5.6 percent tax rate at the state level and two percent at the local level in this calculation. He reported that of the \$1 billion, approximately \$221 million per year would be collected by cities and towns.

Mr. Anderson stated that replacing the fuel tax with state and local sales tax could generate approximately \$337 million per year for ten years, however, modifications might have to be made to the way fuel taxes are collected, which is currently on a wholesale level.

Mr. Anderson then addressed Other Options by saying that increasing the driver's license fee by \$10 would generate approximately \$13 million over ten years, which is not a large amount. He stated that one option includes a ten percent surcharge on luxury tax collections (liquor and tobacco, for example), however, there is not really a link back to transportation. Another option is

a \$10 increase in license registration fees, which could generate approximately \$50 million per year over ten years. Mr. Anderson stated that another option discussed was a property tax for transportation. He said that the average property tax rate in Arizona is \$7.89 per \$100 of assessed valuation. With a two percent tax, approximately \$100 million per year could be generated. Mr. Anderson noted that a property tax as a source for transportation funding was considered in the early 1980s before settling on the sales tax in Proposition 300. He said that it is a large tax base. In addition, the Legislature has been trying to reduce the assessed ratios on commercial properties to bring them more in line with residential properties. Mr. Anderson remarked that there are pros and cons associated with each of the options that would require discussion.

Mr. Anderson displayed the potential transportation revenue sources ranked from the lowest revenue generation to the highest revenue generation. He noted that adding a state and local sales tax on fuel is projected to generate the most revenue, but whether it is politically doable is the question.

Mr. Anderson stated that many issues and decisions need to be made: (1) Quantify needs at different levels: state, regional, or multi-regional; (2) Identify packages and whether one revenue source or multiple revenue sources are needed; (3) Determine the implementation level: legislative, referendum (e.g., Proposition 400), or initiative (more expensive because signatures have to be collected and the campaign run); (4) Determine timing; (5) Determine the partners and stakeholders who need to be involved in the discussion. Mr. Anderson noted that a statewide election means more participants. He noted that extensive outreach and a number of meetings took place with the business community and stakeholders at the beginning of the Proposition 400 process.

Mr. Anderson reviewed next steps: (1) Conduct a public opinion survey to gauge public sentiment and view and needs and revenue sources. He noted that the Executive Committee approved amending the MAG Work Program to include the survey. (2) Synthesize into a research document the numerous public policy documents, such as *The Arizona We Want*, *Arizona Directions*, and the *National League of Cities Metropolitan Leadership Forum*, that show what the public values. (3) At the September Transportation Policy Committee meeting, have a high level overview and discussion of needs, such as highway, street, and transit operations and maintenance, deferred Proposition 400 capital projects, and new needs. (4) Review the survey results at the November Transportation Policy Committee meeting.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Anderson for his report and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Berry thanked Mr. Anderson for his report and asked the total HURF collection. Mr. Anderson replied \$1.2 billion. Mr. Berry remarked that \$100 million per year is a ten percent increase. Mr. Anderson stated that he would revise the chart to show the percentage increases and send it out to the TPC.

Mr. Berry stated that everyone wants mobility and goods movement, but few seem willing to pay for it. He said that MAG and the Legislature have done a good job linking benefits to revenue. Mr. Berry stated that he thought it important to continue to show the benefits throughout the entire

state. He said that the vehicle license tax (VLT), which he did not see on the list, needed more attention and this might be an opportunity for much needed reform. Mr. Berry thought that the automobile registration fees are shamefully low – only \$10 to \$15 per year – and the rest is personal property tax. He stated that if we are to go to the voters for additional funds, he would advise for making a change for constitutional protection from fund shifts, which have been a major source of fund leakage. Mr. Berry added that he thought we owed it to the voters and citizens to do something permanent to protect against fund shifts.

Mr. Anderson replied that 45 percent of the VLT collected goes to HURF and the rest to cities, towns, counties, and the state. He remarked that people think all of the VLT goes toward transportation, but that is not the case. Mr. Anderson stated that the cities, towns and counties depend on those funds, so some sort of combination reform would be needed.

Mayor Wolcott expressed her agreement with Mr. Berry's statements about leakage. She added that leakage is a problem in all states and she thought it would be a good area of focus. Mayor Wolcott stated that there should be discussion of spending on need, which is more and more heading toward transit. She stated that we need to find a dedicated funding source for transit on a more regional scope. Mayor Wolcott recalled a letter she had hand delivered to the Congressional delegation on behalf of MAG that those jurisdictions that contributed their own funds should receive more consideration in the federal component. She remarked that the return from the federal government is an area that needs discussion. Mayor Wolcott stated that the difficult part of a discussion on new taxes will be the distribution formulas, and that will require discussion early in the process. She stated that she did not think there should be only one source of funding, but rather a package that would appeal to different groups and multiple agencies and would include legislative action on HURF protection. Mayor Wolcott stated that the metro area is the largest generator of transportation taxes, but we need to figure out how to best serve the metro area as well as the rest of the state.

Ms. Taylor asked if any analysis had been done to show Arizona's standing against other intermountain west states upon an increase of fuel taxes. She remarked that we do not want to tax ourselves out of being competitive from an economic development standpoint. Mr. Anderson replied that no analysis had yet been done. He mentioned that Reno's indexed gas tax was increased five cents per gallon on July 1, bringing its combined tax rate to 73 cents per gallon, higher than California.

Mayor Lane expressed that he concurred with Ms. Taylor's comments. He said that it is not only important from a competitive viewpoint, but also from a taxpayer's viewpoint because higher fuel taxes can become a burden. Mayor Lane stated that he thought the tax rates with the CPI calculation applied should be discussed. He commented on the percentage versus the cents per gallon issue, by saying that a percentage basis automatically assumes some increase in cost. Mayor Lane stated that the usage of fuel has reduced and the cost of fuel has increased, resulting in a conflicting effect of losing that revenue. He indicated that a percentage would be a good option, but what you add to it to make up shortfall could be a percentage that translates to an increase in the revenue stream. Mayor Lane commented on the leakage issue. He said we need to be candid

with the public about separating the cost, particularly relating to the fuel tax in regard to mass transit or highways. Mayor Lane encouraged defining the mission of what we are trying to accomplish with the tax and convey the percentage and mechanism for mass transit.

Chair Meck asked those participating by teleconference if they had questions. None were noted.

Mayor Lord stated that she thought that the California tax should be used as a bad example. It would say to the public you pay the money but we will not make the improvements.

Mayor Smith asked for more detail on the questions in the survey. Mr. Anderson replied that the survey might ask about current transportation system and future needs, funding concepts, or revenue issues. He remarked that he thought the survey might show that in general, voters are not fully aware of the serious situation for funding the transportation system. Mr. Anderson stated that because this region has added so much capacity, highway miles, and a good transit system, he thought voters will indicate they are satisfied and they do not see a need.

Mayor Smith stated that he did not think the public thinks in terms of policy and that they are satisfied with the new freeways and rail funded by Propositions 300 and 400. He expressed his concern with the manner in which the survey will ask the questions, for example, "Do you believe street maintenance is important and would you be willing to pay for it?" might rank low because it is a policy question. If a survey asks if a pothole should be fixed within 24 hours after you drove through it and lost a tire, he thought it would rank high. Mayor Smith remarked that most of the transportation surveys he had seen were not day-to-day and when questions are personalized you get a different response. He stated that most people do not know the percentage of tax on fuel, they just know the total cost. Mayor Smith stated that gas is a lot more expensive in California than Arizona. People do not know the reason, they just think that gas is more expensive in another state. He said that he would like to believe decision makers have gained the trust of the public because of the high quality projects that have been produced on time.

Vice Chair Sellers stated that people are relatively happy with the transportation system and because of that situation, we are going to have to do a really good job explaining what the problems will be in the future without this funding.

Mayor Wolcott commented on the survey questions. She remarked that the level of satisfaction could vary depending on which part of the region is surveyed. Mayor Wolcott stated that the City of Surprise surveyed its citizens a couple of times and transportation was rated very high on a category that needs improvement. She expressed that where highways and transit are built you will likely see more satisfaction than those areas awaiting investments. Mayor Wolcott remarked that this is what will be tricky about putting together a package without looking at needs across the state. Mayor Wolcott stated that the cost of gasoline is also about refiners and gas prices can fluctuate ten or fifteen cents in one week. She added that raising the gas tax a couple of cents disappears among the overall price.

Mr. Smith described the process in determining questions for a survey leading up to Proposition 400. He said there was a meeting of stakeholders and the TPC to see if the right questions were being asked and they will follow that same process again for this survey.

Mayor Lane stated that the public needs to be presented with the reason current funding is insufficient to cover needs. He said that there is a general assumption that a growing economy funds an increased tax base and so we need to show what has changed, such as reduced gas usage or leakage.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Anderson to describe the option of extending the sales tax horizon. Mr. Anderson stated that the current half-cent sales tax for transportation is a 20-year tax that expires in 2025. He said that extending the sales tax for another 20 years provides the ability for additional bonding and financing to get projects done sooner. Mr. Anderson commented that current attractive interest rates give more flexibility moving forward. He noted that the San Diego transportation sales tax is a 40-year tax and if you are not going for a permanent tax, 40 years is preferable than 20 years from a planning perspective.

Mayor Rankin asked if the planning for a sales tax would be extended out to Pinal County now that Pinal County jurisdictions are MAG members. Mr. Anderson replied that the entire MAG region would be surveyed, but the area could be the Sun Corridor or even the entire state. He said that depending on the package, a county-level tax would need to pertain to that county. Mr. Anderson stated that a tax could be structured a number of ways. He said that needs outside Maricopa County but in the MAG planning area, such as the north-south freeway, are the types of issues that will need to be worked through.

Mayor Smith stated that operational funding for transit ends in 2025 and ADOT does not have funding for maintenance. He said that operational funding is more difficult to explain but needs to be a part besides capital funding. Mayor Smith said that he recalled Arizona was the only state that does not have state funding for supporting transit and in 12 years the operations funding for transit in this region will expire. He said it seems the only solution is to include the never-ending need for operations funding.

Mr. Anderson stated that operations and maintenance funding for transit, highways, and streets should be permanent and sustainable because the needs are always there. Capital projects can be defined as being delivered over a set period of time and are more saleable to the public.

Mr. Smith referenced the Tools component in Mr. Anderson's report. He said that another policy question is how much land is yet to be developed. Mr. Smith stated that MAG staff calculated that 24 percent of land in the Sun Corridor is yet to be developed and 64 percent of that is Arizona state land. He said that Interstate 11 and the north/south corridor are planned through big tracts of state land. Mr. Smith remarked that the state lands issue needs to be dealt with or the long range future of Arizona is not going to happen. He stated that MAG, PAG, CAG, and perhaps JPAC, need to weigh in on this issue. Mr. Smith also suggested asking Vanessa Hickman the needs of the Arizona State Land Department. He noted that ten percent of the land sales off the top was challenged in

the Supreme Court. Mr. Smith stated that the Arizona State Land Department needs the tools to prepare the land. He noted that there is leapfrog development here because the cities have hopped over state lands and that is inefficient land use.

Mayor Lane commented that street and highway improvements add value to adjacent land and returns are realized on the sale of this land.

Supervisor Hickman asked if there was a state considered to be a model in regard to options. Mr. Anderson replied that each state has unique circumstances, but there is not really one state to hold up as a model. He noted that there are some noteworthy pieces done by some states, for example, Virginia just changed its tax from a cents-per-gallon basis to a percentage-per-gallon basis, Utah has utilized financing tools, and Nevada is indexing its gas tax. Mr. Anderson stated that because this is a high growth area, the need for capital expansion is probably greater here than in the Midwest or East.

Mayor Wolcott asked Mr. Anderson if the sales tax horizon was expanded, what did he envision would be the impact to projects that were deferred because the sales tax did not perform. Mr. Anderson replied that in general, projects that were deferred past 2025 could be built sooner than currently planned. He added that technical analyses would probably be done to verify that they are still needed relative to overall travel demand.

Mayor Wolcott commented on meeting needs and gave as an example the City of Mesa recently shifted funds from an arterial project deemed to be unneeded to a light rail project that was needed. Mayor Wolcott remarked that this might occur all over the entire system that a planned project might not come to fruition. She noted that an examination of the project list might be needed to see the needs on the ground.

Mr. Smith spoke regarding model states. He noted that Mr. Anderson and Bob Hazlett visited the director of the Utah Department of Transportation and discussed the percentages of funds that are state and local. Mr. Smith stated that the Utah Legislature is very conservative like the Arizona Legislature, but their funding mix is quite different from ours.

Mr. Anderson explained that the state highway program in Arizona is basically all federal money (80 to 90 percent) with a local match (10 to 20 percent), but in Utah, it is the opposite and its highway program has a lot of statewide funds. He noted that the Utah Legislature has provided funding to the transportation system which has given it a big boost.

Mayor Mitchell asked for clarification of the tools used by Utah that are not used in Arizona. Mr. Anderson replied that one tool utilized by Utah is Tax Increment Financing, which has been used to revitalize downtown Ogden.

Chair Meck noted that no public comment cards had been received.

6. Update on Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study

Bob Hazlett, MAG Engineer, provided a report on the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study. Mr. Hazlett noted that other MAG framework studies include the Interstate 10/ Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study, the Interstates 8 and 10/ Hidden Valley Transportation Framework Study, the Regional Transit Framework Study, the Hassayampa Framework Study for the Wickenburg Area, the Freight Transportation Framework Study, and the Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study. Mr. Hazlett noted that the studies are not fiscally constrained, but are there to provide a broad perspective and inform the next generation Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Hazlett reviewed the timeline of the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study, which began with a large public outreach of more than 500 people in 2011. He commented that the input received assisted in determining the recommendations from the study.

Mr. Hazlett stated that a planning charette, held in 2012, provided a definition of possibilities. He noted that much of the focus ended up on Interstates 10 and 17 and he said that the environmental impact studies for these two corridors were suspended last year. Mr. Hazlett stated that a second charette informed the Interstate 10/17 Corridor Master Plan and spot improvements for both corridors. He noted that the recommendations are currently being reviewed.

Mr. Hazlett reported on work products that have been identified. He noted that the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study area includes the area inside Loop 101. Within this area are about 2.3 million residents and about 1.3 million jobs. Mr. Hazlett displayed a word cloud that shows that items people are discussing the most are transit, roads, system, rail, and need.

Mr. Hazlett reported that fourteen recurring themes resulted from the public outreach and charette activities. He highlighted three of them: (1) Complete Streets. (2) Last Mile Strategies. (3) Road Diets.

Mr. Hazlett expanded on Complete Streets, a study done by MAG which says that streets accommodate all modes of travel, not just automobiles. He stated that Last Mile Strategies provide ways to get from a transit stop to home or work. Mr. Hazlett stated that Road Diets deal with six or seven lane roads that are barriers to walkability.

Mr. Hazlett stated that more than 200 suggestions on transit, pedestrian and bicycle, arterial intersections and links, freeway interchanges and links projects were received at the charette. He noted that many of the suggestions help with the COMPASS study and the Managed Lanes study. Mr. Hazlett stated the 200+ charette projects are currently being entered into a database, mapped, and rated using the EPA/Department of Transportation/HUD Livability-Sustainability criteria to help determine which of the projects would rise to the top.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the consultant came up with a strategy of work products. He said that a workshop was held on the Interstates 10 and 17 Spine and added that the consultant has design

build experience. Mr. Hazlett pointed some solutions they developed for the interchange in order to keep it out of the airspace for Sky Harbor Airport.

Mr. Hazlett stated that capping the footprint was also discussed at the workshop. With many environmental impact studies, the focus has been on increasing capacity, however, there are concerns when freeways are located in highly urbanized areas, which makes expansion difficult. Mr. Hazlett displayed a map that was color-coded to show the tight right-of-way in certain areas.

Mr. Hazlett then displayed a graphic of the freeway system plan that the consultant developed that showed the base condition and different scenarios of how many lanes could fit, the types of lanes, and the barriers. He said that the consultant did this exercise for the entire freeway system and added that this will help decision makers when developing the new regional transportation plan.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the charette identified SR-30 (the Interstate 10 Reliever freeway) as one of the work products. He stated that SR-30 is identified in the current Regional Transportation Plan from Loop 202/South Mountain to Loop 303 and an interim facility to SR-85 in Buckeye. Mr. Hazlett stated that the charette suggested not ending SR-30 at the South Mountain Freeway but continuing it to the Durango Curve. Mr. Hazlett displayed a map that showed the continued route of the corridor and reflected factors such as environmental, Title VI, floodplain, the Interstate 17 interchange, and provisions connecting to Avenida Rio Salado. He noted that the map was run through a traffic model. Mr. Hazlett added that this segment of SR-30 would carry about 170,000 vehicles per day by 2035.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the next work product is park and ride lots and how to link them. He said that the consultants looked at best practices in San Diego, Denver, and Seattle to help define integration of transit stations with the freeway system. Mr. Hazlett stated that this establishes a background for the development of future direct high occupancy vehicle (DHOV) ramps. He said that DHOV connections help the system in eliminating vehicle weave and accommodating transit. Mr. Hazlett pointed out the DHOV ramps on the MAG system and noted that one is currently under construction at Loop 101/Agua Fria and Maryland Avenue near the Glendale stadium. He stated that more than 35 DHOV ramp locations were identified from the charette, and this number was then narrowed down based on system and land use compatibility. Mr. Hazlett then displayed a map of existing, candidate, and proposed DHOV ramps on the MAG freeway system.

Mr. Hazlett stated that more information on additional work products would be provided at a future meeting. He said that roadway maintenance is something that cannot be ignored. When you look to the planning horizon for the next generation regional transportation plan, the Stack will be 50 years old and maintenance will be needed.

Chair Meck thanked Mr. Hazlett for his report and asked if there were questions.

Mayor Rogers asked if the outside of Loop 101 had been studied because Avondale was building a park and ride lot. Mr. Hazlett replied that the Central Phoenix Transportation Framework Study

is mostly concerned with the central urban area, but has also provided tools to look to the outside. He said that one goal is to have good access at park and ride lots and DHOV lanes.

Mr. Arnett requested that a copy of the presentation be sent to him.

7. Legislative Update

No report.

8. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Transportation Policy Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting were requested.

No requests were received.

9. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity was provided for Transportation Policy Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Transportation Policy Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

No comments were noted.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Wolcott moved, Mayor Mitchell seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 1:16 p.m.

Chair

Secretary